

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

Digital Repository

Iowa State Research Farm Progress Reports

2011

2003 Wine Grape Cultivar Trial Performance

Paul A. Domoto

Iowa State University, domoto@iastate.edu

Gail R. Nonnecke

Iowa State University, nonnecke@iastate.edu

Joseph M. Hannan

Iowa State University, jmhannan@iastate.edu

Dennis N. Portz

Iowa State University

Leah B. Riesselman

Iowa State University, lriessel@iastate.edu

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/farms_reports



Part of the [Agricultural Science Commons](#), [Agriculture Commons](#), [Fruit Science Commons](#), and the [Horticulture Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Domoto, Paul A.; Nonnecke, Gail R.; Hannan, Joseph M.; Portz, Dennis N.; Riesselman, Leah B.; Havlovic, Bernard J.; Howell, Nicholas P.; Pecinovsky, Kenneth T.; and Van Dee, Kevin, "2003 Wine Grape Cultivar Trial Performance" (2011). *Iowa State Research Farm Progress Reports*. 228.

http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/farms_reports/228

This report is brought to you for free and open access by Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Iowa State Research Farm Progress Reports by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.

2003 Wine Grape Cultivar Trial Performance

Abstract

To assess the regional adaptation of wine grape cultivars in Iowa, a trial was established in 2003 through an Iowa Department of Agriculture and Land Stewardship (IDALS) specialty crops grant awarded to the Iowa Wine Growers Association (IWGA). The trial was designed to evaluate up to 20 cultivars or advanced selections at four Iowa State University (ISU) farms representing different geographic, climatic, and soil conditions: Horticulture Research Station (HRS), Ames; the Armstrong Research Farm (ARF), Lewis; the Southeast Research Farm (SERF), Crawfordsville; and the Northeast Research Farm (NERF), Nashua. The SERF and NERF plantings also included the 15 cultivars being evaluated in the 2002 grape cultivar by management system trial. This report summarizes the results for the 2010 growing season.

Keywords

RFR A1039, Horticulture

Disciplines

Agricultural Science | Agriculture | Fruit Science | Horticulture

Authors

Paul A. Domoto, Gail R. Nonnecke, Joseph M. Hannan, Dennis N. Portz, Leah B. Riesselman, Bernard J. Havlovic, Nicholas P. Howell, Kenneth T. Pecinovsky, and Kevin Van Dee

2003 Wine Grape Cultivar Trial Performance

RFR-A1039

Paul Domoto, professor
Gail Nonnecke, university professor
Department of Horticulture
Joe Hannan, Dennis Portz, and Leah
Riesselman, ag specialists
Bernie Havlovic, Nick Howell, Ken
Pecinovsky, and Kevin Van Dee,
farm superintendents

Introduction

To assess the regional adaptation of wine grape cultivars in Iowa, a trial was established in 2003 through an Iowa Department of Agriculture and Land Stewardship (IDALS) specialty crops grant awarded to the Iowa Wine Growers Association (IWGA). The trial was designed to evaluate up to 20 cultivars or advanced selections at four Iowa State University (ISU) farms representing different geographic, climatic, and soil conditions: Horticulture Research Station (HRS), Ames; the Armstrong Research Farm (ARF), Lewis; the Southeast Research Farm (SERF), Crawfordville; and the Northeast Research Farm (NERF), Nashua. The SERF and NERF plantings also included the 15 cultivars being evaluated in the 2002 grape cultivar by management system trial. This report summarizes the results for the 2010 growing season.

Materials and Methods

The vines were spaced 8 × 10 ft apart (545 vines/acre) with three vines/replication. Treatments were replicated four times at each site (12 vines/cultivar). Vines were trained to a bilateral cordon system on a two-wire trellis with wires at 3.5 ft and 6.0 ft above the ground. Vines with a procumbent growth habit were being trained to the top wire, while those

with a semi-upright to upright growth habit were trained to the mid-level wire with vertical shoot positioning (VSP) practiced.

In mid-March, five proximal (basal) buds on two canes per vine (30 buds/replication) were dissected and evaluated for primary bud injury. Bud retention was based on pruning weight, and adjusted for primary bud mortality when injury exceeded 15 percent for American cultivars and 20 percent for French-American hybrid cultivars. Date of bud break was recorded at ARF and HRS. Following *veraison*, berry samples were collected from the mid-cluster position to test for maturity based on percentage soluble solids (% SS), initial pH, and titratable acids (TA). Time of harvest was based on these measurements and fruit condition. At harvest, the number of clusters per vine were counted and weighed.

Results and Discussion

During the 2009–10 winter, vines were exposed to significant freezes in early October, December, and January with NERF followed by HRS recording the lowest temperatures (Table 1). When cane buds were examined for injury prior to pruning, greater injury was found at NERF and HRS, than at ARF or SERF (Table 2). At all four sites, the injury was generally greatest on cultivars classified as being “slightly hardy” to “moderately hardy,” while those classified as being “very hardy” exhibited the least bud injury. Bud injury following the 2009–10 winter was generally greater than the previous winter when lower temperatures were recorded. The early October freeze was probably the contributing factor because the 2009 growing season was cooler than normal and many cultivars matured much later than normal.

On May 9, vines at HRS and NERF were exposed to a spring frost (Table 1). Injury at HRS was greater with most primary shoots killed (Table 2).

Based on pruning weights, vines generally grew better at ARF than at the other sites in 2010 (Table 3). However, considerable cane die back was observed, particularly at HRS and NERF. Based on the length of established cordon per vine, the less hardy cultivars continue to perform better at ARF and SERF than at HRS or NERF.

The 2010 growing season was characterized by warmer than normal growing conditions with the departure from normal for growing degree days being the greatest at ARF (Table 1). The greatest number of days with the temperature above 86°F was recorded at SERF followed by ARF and NERF. As a result, harvest was advanced compared with previous years at ARF (Table 4) and SERF (Table 5). With vines at HRS and NERF being exposed to the May 9 frost, harvest at both sites was delayed. Yield per vine and average cluster weights were generally lower than in previous years at each of the sites, and was a reflection of the high primary bud injury recorded at each site, and the frost that

occurred at HRS and NERF. Generally, yields per vine were greater on cold hardy cultivars than on moderately hardy cultivars.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to the IDALS and the IWGA for providing support to establish these plantings through a specialty crops grant, and the Iowa Grape and Wine Commission for previous funding. Thanks to the staff at the ISU Horticulture Research Station and the Armstrong, Southeast, and Northeast Research Farms for their assistance in maintaining the plantings.

Table 1. Significant minimum temperatures (°F) recorded during the 2009-10 winter and accumulated growing degree days from May 1 to October 1, 2010.

Date	ARF	HRS	SERF	NERF
Minimum temperatures (°F):				
Oct 10	25	24	25	22
Dec 10	-11	-10	-6	-9
Jan 2	-18	-21	-18	-20
May 9	35	29	35	30
Growing Degree Days (base 50°F, cap. 86°F):				
May 1 to Oct 1 ²	3,018	2,943	3,026	2,775
Departure from avg. 163		112	-84	100
Days above 86 °F	25	11	29	20

²From the ISU Ag Climate Network.

Table 2. Primary bud injury following exposure to freezes during the 2009–10 winter for 20 cultivars in the ISU 2003 wine grape cultivar trial planted at the Armstrong Research Farm (ARF) and Horticulture Research Station (HRS), and the 35 cultivars at the Southeast (SERF) and Northeast (NERF) Research Farms; bud break at ARF and HRS; and frost injury rating at HRS and NERF following a May 9 freeze.

Treatment	Relative hardiness ^z	% Primary Bud Injury				Bud Break ^y		Frost Injury Rating ^x	
		ARF	HRS	SERF	NERF	ARF	HRS	HRS	NERF
Vidal Blanc	4	51	97	80	50	121	119	5.0	1.0
Cayuga White	4	73	100	63	93	120	128	.	1.0
Landot 4511	4	76	97	77	90	123	128	.	1.0
Noiret	4	65	88	50	78	114	115	5.0	2.5
NY84.0101.04	4	48	.	43	53	122	120	.	2.0
Corot noir	4	40	98	40	69	120	113	5.0	1.7
NY76.0844.24	4	47	91	49	53	115	110	4.8	2.3
De Chaunac	4	48	93	28	52	114	110	5.0	3.3
St. Vincent	4	51	97	41	54	115	117	5.0	2.6
Léon Millot	5	29	65	21	32	112	108	4.8	3.8
Esprit	5	56	83	41	53	115	109	5.0	2.7
GR-7	5	38	92	34	66	111	107	5.0	3.3
Chancellor	5	35	72	10	19	113	110	5.0	2.5
Brianna	6	20	38	21	15	110	107	4.8	2.8
Swenson White	6	36	68	18	33	112	109	5.0	2.8
MN-1198	6	39	70	24	32	109	107	4.8	3.1
Marquette	6	30	22	19	11	108	107	3.4	3.0
Prairie Star	6	28	29	11	12	114	108	5.0	3.7
La Crescent	6	23	20	21	37	109	105	4.1	3.0
Frontenac Gris ^w	6	18	48	10	31	111	107	4.8	2.7
Chambourcin	3			51	100				1.0
Seyval Blanc	4			70	94				3.2
Vignole	4			27	81				1.5
Traminette	4			42	.				.
Cynthiana	4			23	79				1.0
Maréchal Foch	5			38	26				3.9
St. Croix	6			28	28				2.5
Edelweiss	5			23	28				3.4
La Crosse	5			10	37				3.7
Frontenac	6			25	22				2.4
Marquis	4			63	65				1.3
Vanessa	4			98	90				1.3
Reliance	4			55	83				2.1
Mars	4			48	54				2.7
Jupiter	4			80	85				1.8
LSD, P < .05		14	17	17	19	2	2	0.3	0.7

^zRelative cold hardiness (temperature range at which injury begins to occur): 3 = cold tender/slightly hardy (-5°F); 4 = moderately hardy (-10°F); 5 = hardy (-15°F); 6 = very hardy (-20°F).

^yJulian date; 121 = May 1, 2010.

^xFrost injury rating: 1 = no injury evident; 2 = slight, most clusters survived; 3 = moderate; most clusters killed, most shoots alive; 4 = severe, all clusters killed, some shoots alive at the base; 5 = very severe, all shoots killed to the base.

^wPlanted in 2004 at the Horticulture Research Station and in 2006 at the other sites.

Table 3. Pruning weight and feet of established cordon following the 2009 growing season for 20 cultivars in the ISU 2003 wine grape cultivar trial planted at the Armstrong Research Farm (ARF) and the Horticulture Research Station (HRS), and 35 cultivars at the Southeast (SERF) and Northeast (NERF) Research Farms.

Treatment	Pruning weight (lb)				Feet of cordon per vine			
	ARF	HRS	SERF	NERF	ARF	HRS	SERF	NERF
Vidal Blanc	2.8	1.1	2.1	0.4	7.1	1.4	6.1	0.3
Cayuga White	1.9	1.2	1.5	0.5	5.7	0.5	6.3	1.3
Landot 4511	3.8	1.2	1.8	0.5	7.5	1.3	6.7	1.3
Noiret ^w	3.3	1.3	2.6	1.1	7.9	1.4	7.7	5.4
NY84.0101.04	2.0	0.7	1.2	0.6	4.8	0.0	5.7	0.9
Corot noir ^w	2.7	1.1	2.2	0.7	8.0	1.6	6.5	4.6
NY76.0844.24 ^z	1.6	1.9	0.8	0.4	6.8	7.2	7.0	3.8
De Chaunac	5.0	3.4	5.0	2.4	7.7	1.5	7.1	7.8
St. Vincent	4.1	3.5	3.1	1.6	6.4	3.5	7.6	4.2
Léon Millot	3.4	2.1	2.5	1.1	7.9	7.2	7.6	7.0
Esprit	3.6	3.2	3.2	1.0	8.0	7.9	7.3	6.7
GR-7	4.0	3.3	3.3	1.8	8.0	7.3	7.0	7.7
Chancellor	2.8	1.3	0.6	0.2	8.0	5.8	6.8	6.1
Brianna ^z	3.0	2.9	3.0	0.8	8.0	7.8	7.1	7.4
Swenson White ^x	2.6	2.1	2.7	1.0	8.0	7.3	6.0	7.3
MN-1198 ^y	1.5	0.7	0.8	0.3	7.8	7.2	7.5	5.7
Marquette ^{z, w}	2.5	4.0	2.0	0.5	7.4	7.8	7.2	6.3
Prairie Star	3.4	5.8	2.9	2.1	7.9	7.7	6.8	7.6
La Crescent	3.6	2.8	3.8	2.0	8.0	7.8	7.1	6.4
Frontenac Gris ^y	1.1	1.2	0.6	0.2	7.8	7.3	4.0	4.4
Seyval Blanc			1.4	0.8			7.4	4.9
Chambourcin			1.4	0.7			4.8	0.2
Vignole			1.7	1.0			7.6	4.0
Traminette			1.7	0.5			6.6	0.0
Cynthiana			2.4	1.0			6.7	1.4
Maréchal Foch			0.6	0.2			6.4	6.2
St. Croix			2.4	1.4			7.8	8.0
Edelweiss			2.7	1.2			7.5	7.2
La Crosse			2.8	1.9			7.3	7.6
Frontenac			1.6	0.6			7.4	7.2
Marquis			1.4	0.3			5.0	0.8
Vanessa			1.9	0.4			4.5	1.1
Reliance			1.7	0.9			7.2	7.3
Mars			4.0	2.1			7.8	7.8
Jupiter			2.6	0.7			7.0	1.7
LSD, P < .05	0.7	0.8	0.9	0.4	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5

^zPlanted in 2004.^yPlanted in 2004 at the Horticulture Research Station and in 2006 at the other sites.^xPlanted in 2005.^wNamed and released in 2006: Noiret (NY73.136.17); Corot noir (NY70.0809.10); and Marquette (MN-1211).

Table 4. Fruit yield and harvest characteristics in 2010 for 20 cultivars in the ISU 2003 wine grape cultivar trial planted at the Armstrong Research Farm and Horticulture Research Station.

Treatment	Armstrong Research Farm						Horticulture Research Station						
	Harvest date	% SS	pH ^y	TA ^z	Yield /vine (lb)	Cluster wt (lb)	Harvest date	% SS	pH	TA ^z	Yield /vine (lb)	Cluster wt (lb)	
Léon Millot	8/12	17.8	3.57	8.4	11.7	.22	9/8	20.1	3.70	5.7	5.5	.10	
Brianna ^y	8/18	15.7	3.43	6.6	18.1	.29	9/8	16.9	3.67	5.6	7.6	.16	
NY84.0101.04	8/18	18.0	3.49	8.3	2.3	.37	0.0	.	
Prairie Star	8/19	15.9	3.63	9.6	11.5	.19	9/8	18.9	3.72	7.1	13.7	.14	
MN-1198 ^y	8/19	19.6	3.17	12.6	13.3	.28	9/13	21.7	3.17	9.4	2.4	.12	
Esprit	8/23	14.9	3.42	10.1	18.4	.58	9/17	18.4	3.42	7.1	9.7	.40	
Swenson White ^w	8/24	16.6	3.39	6.5	15.2	.41	9/13	18.6	2.72	4.8	12.8	.25	
NY76.0844.24 ^y	8/24	15.8	3.26	8.9	4.7	.16	10/11	17.1	3.31	6.6	0.9	.12	
Cayuga White	8/25	16.8	3.17	8.9	6.1	.47	0.0	.	
Marquette ^y	8/30	23.5	3.57	7.4	7.3	.13	9/17	23.2	3.61	7.5	10.0	.09	
Landot 4511	8/30	18.7	3.65	6.1	8.1	.28	0.0	.	
Frontenac Gris ^x	8/30	23.5	3.42	9.6	13.6	.25	9/17	25.3	3.40	8.6	8.4	.13	
De Chaunac	8/30	17.8	3.56	7.7	12.8	.24	10/11	20.3	3.55	5.5	1.4	.17	
La Crescent	8/31	22.6	3.61	9.7	16.2	.31	9/17	22.8	3.38	10.7	11.3	.15	
GR-7	8/31	17.8	3.77	8.4	11.2	.24	10/8	21.4	3.79	6.7	1.8	.13	
Noiret	9/1	16.1	3.44	8.7	4.4	.25	10/8	17.5	3.51	7.0	1.4	.17	
Corot noir	9/1	16.4	3.70	5.4	18.3	.45	10/8	19.5	3.53	6.0	0.9	.18	
Chancellor	9/1	18.7	3.51	7.1	29.9	.44	10/8	17.6	3.2	9.0	0.2	.16	
Vidal Blanc	9/7	18.2	3.48	7.8	7.7	.40	10/11	19.3	3.26	8.4	0.2	.16	
St. Vincent	9/30	18.6	3.49	7.6	12.5	.47	10/8	20.1	3.24	6.7	1.8	.23	
LSD, P < .05					4.0	.06						2.3	.04

^zTitrateable acids reported in grams/liter.^yPlanted in 2004.^xPlanted in 2004 at the Horticulture Research Station and in 2006 at the other sites.^wPlanted in 2005.

Table 5. Fruit yield and harvest characteristics in 2010 for 35 cultivars in the ISU 2003 wine grape cultivar trial planted at the Southeast and Northeast Research Farms.

Treatment	Southeast Research Farm						Northeast Research Farm					
	Harvest date	% SS	pH	TA ^z	Yield /vine (lb)	Cluster wt (lb)	Harvest date	% SS	pH	TA ^z	Yield /vine (lb)	Cluster wt (lb)
Vanessa	8/2	18.6	3.15	7.4	0.2	.17	8/19	.	.	.	0.1	.19
Reliance	8/2	20.3	3.14	7.1	9.3	.40	8/19	20.8	3.35	6.4	7.8	.55
Jupiter	8/5	17.6	3.50	5.0	9.9	.28	8/19	18.0	3.75	4.8	0.8	.28
Prairie Star	8/5	15.2	3.29	10.7	7.9	.18	8/20	16.2	3.40	9.5	13.0	.31
Brianna ^y	8/5	16.9	3.31	7.8	12.3	.22	8/23	18.5	3.48	6.8	14.1	.30
Léon Millot	8/5	18.2	3.42	7.9	13.3	.18	8/24	20.3	3.72	6.2	8.4	.19
MN-1198 ^y	8/10	19.5	3.23	11.3	5.2	.22	9/1	22.5	3.17	9.7	5.5	.18
Marquette ^y	8/10	21.3	3.20	9.2	5.3	.13	9/2	20.1	3.34	7.6	6.8	.16
Marquis	8/10	15.2	3.48	4.7	5.0	.39	9/10	18.7	3.51	3.5	1.2	.48
Mars	8/10	14.9	3.14	7.7	3.0	.30	9/17	18.2	3.58	5.3	9.1	.29
Maréchal Foch	8/16	20.4	3.50	7.1	7.7	.19	8/23	20.4	3.46	7.5	5.6	.14
Esprit	8/16	15.3	3.30	9.6	16.8	.53	8/23	17.1	3.15	11.1	10.1	.47
Edelweiss	8/16	14.6	3.41	6.3	6.7	.24	8/24	14.7	3.49	7.4	5.9	.29
NY84.0101.04	8/16	18.9	3.41	5.9	9.0	.37	9/1	20.8	3.40	7.6	0.4	.19
Cayuga White	8/16	18.5	3.14	6.3	4.7	.44	9/2	16.0	2.98	15.2	1.0	.20
Landot 4511	8/16	18.6	3.23	5.1	4.0	.17	9/2	20.1	3.57	5.6	0.4	.12
La Crescent	8/16	20.6	3.34	10.3	5.3	.27	9/3	22.0	3.48	9.8	9.6	.27
La Crosse	8/16	16.1	3.18	8.4	15.2	.29	9/3	19.0	3.34	8.1	17.5	.26
NY76.0844.24 ^y	8/16	15.5	3.12	9.3	4.3	.18	9/8	20.1	3.34	7.6	3.5	.18
Seyval Blanc	8/16	20.6	3.49	5.1	10.2	.51	9/15	20.6	3.07	12.5	5.3	.24
St. Croix	8/16	16.7	3.54	7.1	9.0	.22	9/20	20.6	3.79	6.0	4.9	.14
Swenson White ^x	8/17	17.1	3.39	5.0	9.4	.39	8/20	15.0	3.06	9.5	11.2	.38
GR-7	8/17	17.6	3.44	8.5	7.6	.18	8/27	18.4	3.50	9.6	9.9	.28
Corot noir	8/17	15.7	3.41	6.2	8.9	.37	9/9	18.4	3.43	5.9	7.4	.42
Frontenac Gris ^w	8/17	21.2	3.12	10.2	4.0	.20	9/9	24.3	3.30	9.2	4.8	.20
De Chaunac	8/26	18.4	3.47	5.3	11.7	.19	9/1	18.7	3.41	6.6	14.7	.28
Vignole	8/26	22.1	3.24	8.9	6.5	.20	9/10	25.0	3.29	10.3	3.6	.23
Vidal Blanc	8/26	19.3	3.36	6.9	8.0	.34	0.0	.
Chancellor	8/31	19.9	3.50	5.6	16.4	.33	8/27	16.5	3.28	9.5	7.9	.24
Frontenac	8/31	21.6	3.35	9.1	9.9	.24	9/9	22.4	3.21	10.7	10.3	.22
Traminette	9/2	22.3	3.33	5.3	3.2	.18	0.0	.
Noiret	9/2	18.0	3.43	5.8	3.4	.21	9/21	18.1	3.36	11.3	2.3	.22
St. Vincent	9/21	19.6	3.42	5.6	16.3	.55	9/22	18.6	3.10	9.2	10.2	.55
Chambourcin	9/21	22.8	3.49	6.0	3.7	.48	0.0	.
Cynthiana	10/12	.	.	.	4.5	.12	9/22	21.1	3.03	18.6	1.1	.12
LSD, P < .05					3.2	.07					2.8	.06

^zTitrateable acids reported in grams/liter.^yPlanted in 2004.^xPlanted in 2005.^wPlanted in 2006.